



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,728	04/02/2004	Takayuki Ishiguro	KY-198	9473

7590 08/01/2006
MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
Suite 370
1800 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PHAM, HOA Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,728

Applicant(s)

ISHIGURO, TAKAYUKI

Examiner

Hoa Q. Pham

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings filed on 4/2/04 are accepted.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

With respect to the present abstract, the term "means" should be avoided.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 1, line 7; the term "whch" should be changed to --which--. This is an example, applicant is

required to correct all of the minor informalities such as typos, grammars, inconsistent use of terms (and/or numerals).

Claim Objections

5. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 9, line 11 should be ended by a --;--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1—3, 9-11, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagen et al (US 2002/0154298 A1).

Regarding claims 1, Hagen discloses an optical system for detecting defect a edge portion of a disk (12) which is translucent or transparent, comprising: an illumination system (10) for illuminating light beam (11) to inspected region (14) of said edge portion said disk (12) through an inside portion of said disk by directing the light beam (11) at a predetermined incident angle with respect to a peripheral surface of said disk to be inspected; and a first light receiving system (22) provided externally of said disk in a vicinity of said inspected region, receiving scattered light from said inspected region.

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16; see above claim 1 and paragraph ([0020]) for disk rotation, thus it is inherent that the disk is mounted on a spindle.

Regarding claims 3, 10-11 and 17-18, see "abstract" for glass disk and figure 1 for the light beam (11), which made a spot on an outer peripheral surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-8, 12-15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagen et al in view of Brunfeld et al (6,294,793) and Dotan (5,355,213).

Regarding claims 4, 12 and 19; Hagen et al does not explicitly teach the use of an additional second light receiving system; however, such a feature is known in the art as taught by Brunfeld et al. Brunfeld et al, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the use of a plurality of light receiving systems of detecting the defects at the edge of and/or within the glass disk (figure 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in Hagen et al an additional light receiving system if additional inspection is desired.

Regarding claims 5-6, 13-14, and 20, Hagen et al does not teach or suggest that the light source is a laser; however, such a feature is known in the art as taught by

Art Unit: 2877

Dotan. Dotan, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the use of a laser source (column 4, line 54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the light source of Hagen et al by a laser source because they both use of detecting defects of a transparent material. In addition, Dotan suggests that any convenient electromagnetic radiation may be used, such as laser, xenon, halogen, etc.... (column 4, lines 51-59). It is also noted that figure 6 of Brunfeld et al teaches that the light receiving systems can be located at about 45 degrees with respect the surface of the disk.

10. Claims 7-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagen et al, Brunfeld et al and Dotan as applied to claims 1-6, 9-14 above, and further in view of Yoshiyama et al (6,078,385).

Hagen et al does not explicitly teach the use of an optical fiber for receiving light from test disk to the detector; however, such a feature is known in the art as taught by Yoshiyama et al. Yoshiyama et al, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the use of optical fibers (7,8) for transmitting scattered light from the test disk (1) the receivers (9,10) (figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include on Hagen et al an optical fiber taught by Yoshiyama et al for the purpose of transmitting scattered light to the detector. The rationale for this modification would have arisen from the fact that using such optical fiber would prevent light lost from the inspection system, thus increase the signal to noise ratio.

Art Unit: 2877


11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Following references relate to an inspection system for detecting defects from transparent material: Kim et al (6,822,735), Gerstner et al (6,927,848), Champetier (4,808,813), Henley et al (5,790,247), Chiu et al (6,690,460) and Okahira et al (US 2001/0002862 A1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa Q. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2426. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 6 PM, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2877

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Hoa Q. Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2877

HP
July 23, 2006